

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

It is respectfully requested that the Office withdraw the finality of the rejection. With the possible exception of the Section 112 rejection concerning "at least one wing member," none of the rejections appear to have been made in the previous office action. As to the "at least one wing member" rejection, it appears to ignore an amendment made to claim 1, as discussed below, and not to be well founded. It is not apparent on what basis the rejection could be made final.

The specification has been amended to insert headings for various sections to place it in better form for prosecution in the United States.


The response of March 30, 2010 amended claim 1 to recite in line 6 "at least two wing members." The Office indicates that "[n]ot a single disclosed embodiment is drawn to a mode wherein only one wing member is used." Even if that is true, it should not result in a rejection since claim 1 recites "at least two wing members." There is a line in claim 1 wherein "at least one said wing member" is mentioned, but that refers to the presence of the engagement element on at least one of the wing members and does not recite or imply that only one wing member is present in the lid of the invention. Consequently, it is requested that the Section 112 rejection of claim 1 be withdrawn.

Claims 17 and 18 have been amended to make them clearer, as supported on page 4, at paragraphs 4 and 5.

Claim 1 has been amended, without prejudice, to incorporate the limitations of claim 14. Claim 14 has been canceled without prejudice. Since the Office has indicated that claim 14 is allowable, it is believed that incorporation into claim 1 of claim 14 renders all claims allowable.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully requested that the application, as amended, be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,



Gerard J. McGowan, Jr.
Registration No. 29,412
Attorney for Applicant(s)

GJM/mpk
(201) 894-2297